

DENISE M. MINGRONE
(STATE BAR NO. 135224)
dmingrone@orrick.com
ROBERT L. URIARTE
(STATE BAR NO. 258274)
ruriarte@orrick.com
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
1000 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025-1015
Telephone: +1 650 614 7400
Facsimile: +1 650 614 7401

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant
SYNOPSISYS, INC.

JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR
(STATE BAR NO. 161368)
JTaylor@mofo.com
JOYCE LIU
(STATE BAR NO. 277720)
JLiou@mofo.com
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: +1 415 268-7000
Facsimile: +1 415 268-7522

Attorneys for
Defendant/Counterclaimant
UBIQUITI NETWORKS INC.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

SYNOPSISYS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBIQUITI NETWORKS, INC., UBIQUITI
NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,
CHING-HAN TSAI, and DOES 1-20, inclusive,

Defendants.

UBIQUITI NETWORKS, INC.

Counterclaimant,

v.

SYNOPSISYS, INC.,

Counterdefendant.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00561-WHO

**JOINT STIPULATION AND
PROPOSED ORDER RE
UBIQUITI NETWORKS, INC.'S
MOTION TO STRIKE
SYNOPSISYS, INC.'S FIFTEEN
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Date: May 17, 2017
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Place: Courtroom 2, 17th Floor
Judge: Hon. William H. Orrick

1 Counsel for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant Synopsys, Inc. and counsel for
2 Defendant/Counterclaimant Ubiquiti Networks, Inc. (“Ubiquiti”), hereby stipulate to (and ask the
3 Court to take note of) the following:

4 1. On April 11, 2017, Ubiquiti filed a motion to strike Synopsys’ fifteen affirmative
5 defenses in Synopsys’ answer to Ubiquiti’s counterclaims. Dkt. 32.

6 2. Synopsys’ opposition to that motion to strike would have been due on April 25,
7 2017. But rather than file an opposition, Synopsys elected to file a first amended answer, as a
8 matter of course, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(1). *See* Dkt. 37.

9 3. Synopsys’ first amended answer supersedes its original answer.

10 4. Because Ubiquiti’s motion to strike is directed at the now-superseded original
11 answer, Ubiquiti’s motion to strike has become moot.

12 5. Counsel for Synopsys and Ubiquiti request that the Court deny Ubiquiti’s motion
13 to strike as moot.

14 6. Counsel for Synopsys and Ubiquiti agree that it is no longer necessary to address
15 Ubiquiti’s motion to strike at the currently-scheduled hearing of May 17, 2017.

16 Signatures for counsel are on the next page.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: April 25, 2017

DENISE M. MINGRONE
ROBERT L. URIARTE
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SULTCLIFFE
LLP

4 By: /s/Denise M. Mingrone
DENISE M. MINGRONE

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
SYNOPSYS, INC.

7 Dated: April 25, 2017

JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR
JOYCE LIOU
AMANDA D. PHILLIPS
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

10 By: /s/Jennifer Lee Taylor
JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR

12 Attorneys for Defendant
UBIQUITI NETWORKS INC.

14 **CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1(i)(3) ATTESTATION**

15 I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each
16 of the other signatories hereto.

18 Dated: April 25, 2017

By: /s/Denise M. Mingrone
DENISE M. MINGRONE

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, Ubiquiti's Motion to Strike (Dkt. 32) is DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

Hon. William H. Orrick
U.S. District Judge